

Decision Notice & Finding of No Significant Impact

Kisatchie National Forest Plan Amendment # 9 Prohibiting Dog-Deer Hunting

USDA Forest Service
Kisatchie National Forest
Louisiana

Decision and Reasons for the Decision

Decision

Based on consideration of the environmental analysis, and on the entirety of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, I have chosen Alternative 2, the proposed action, which prohibits the use of dogs to hunt deer on the entire Kisatchie National Forest. The use of dogs for hunting other wildlife such as squirrel, game bird, raccoon, and rabbit will continue.

I have taken into careful and thorough consideration the individual and group comments, letters, petitions, congressional calls and statements and the completed environmental analysis in making this decision. I have visited the Kisatchie National Forest (KNF), evaluated the landscapes and driven roads where the activity takes place. Alternative 2 strikes the best balance among the critical safety, social, economic and natural resource issues identified and evaluated in the NEPA process.

Background

It is important that in relaying my decision, the history and background of dog-deer hunting on the KNF be described. Hunting, in many forms, has been for decades and continues to be a compatible activity on the Kisatchie National Forest. Gun deer hunting is the primary hunting activity on the Forest. Among all State and Federal landowners in Louisiana, the KNF consistently provides the highest number of days for gun deer hunting on public lands.

The hunting regulations within the State of Louisiana are determined through a process managed by the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission (LWFC). In the Louisiana hunting regulations, the only other public land designated for dog-deer hunting is the state-owned and managed Atchafalaya Basin/Swamp in southeast Louisiana where leases for dog-deer hunting are not required. Many of the more than 1,000,000 State-administered acres across Louisiana are designated for deer hunting *without* dogs.

Prior to setting annual hunting regulations, the LWFC requests that the KNF, similar to other Federal and State entities, propose recommendations to be given to the public for review during their annual comment period and public hearings held in the Winter and

Spring preceding that year's Fall hunting season. Over the past several years, dog-deer hunting on the KNF has been steadily reduced, from a high of 28 days in the mid-1990's, to a low of 8 days in 2009/2010. For many years (approximately 1992 to 2008) the dog-deer season was 14 days. During this time, the use of dogs to hunt deer became very contentious among adjacent forest landowners, recreationists and even some hunters. This conflict reached an untenable level that resulted in the KNF Forest Supervisor, starting in 2003, to recommend a 7-day season to the LWFC. These recommendations were not adopted, and the situation on the ground continued to deteriorate.

In the Spring of 2007, the KNF again proposed to the Commission to decrease dog-deer hunting days to 7 for the 2007/2008 season. After much heated debate, the Commission accepted this proposal, and stated that they would look at going to 0 days of dog-deer hunting the next year (2008/2009). In the Summer of 2008, several Federal and State elected officials asked the Forest Supervisor to restore the 14-day season. Discussions then led to a compromise season of 10 days for 2008/2009. The KNF Forest Supervisor wrote to the Commission Secretary at this time to affirm, "I believe conflicts with dog-deer hunters and Forest neighbors will continue as long as dog-deer hunting continues." Serious conflict did continue in the 2008/2009 season, and during the 2009 LWFC hearings, the Forest indicated their desire to eliminate the dog-deer hunting season on the KNF beginning with the 2009/2010 season.

The Forest Service recommendation to eliminate dog-deer hunting from the KNF was strongly and steadfastly supported by relieved Louisiana adjacent landowners. As recounted in their statements to Forest Service managers, many of these adjacent landowners had for years experienced personal property vandalism, personal confrontations, livestock harassment, reckless driving, fear for personal and family safety due to shooting from and across roads, shooting near homes, road damage from influx of dog-deer hunters and reprisal by some dog-deer hunters for voicing their opinions critical of dog-deer hunters.

This recommendation also brought an outcry by dog-deer hunters, who viewed the dog-deer hunting season on the KNF as one of the last opportunities to dog-deer hunt on public lands in Louisiana without paying for a lease. They stated that ending this season would put an end to the dog-deer hunting culture on public lands. Dog-deer hunting does occur in Louisiana on private lands but usually requires payment for a lease.

During the Spring 2009 hearings on hunting regulations, written comments taken by LDWF revealed that most of the participants supported the KNF recommendation to eliminate the dog-deer hunting season from the KNF. This information, combined with the continued serious conflicts with landowners and other recreationists, and the growing issues with safety, led me to a determination that change was needed. I received clarification that as the Federal deciding official, the decision to determine activities on federal Forest Service lands was within my official capacity.

In June of 2009, through verbal and written communication, I informed Congressional offices of my intention to initiate the NEPA process, which would lead to a decision on

the use of dogs to hunt deer on the KNF. At the same time, the Forest Supervisor informed the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission that we would be proceeding to make adjustments for the KNF prior to the 2010/2011 hunting season. Since I did not expect to issue my decision before the start of the 2009/2010 hunting season, the LDWF Commission decided to establish an 8 day dog-deer hunting season on the KNF for 2009/2010. In August 2009, public scoping was initiated. The proposal stated, "To prohibit the use of dogs to hunt deer on the entire Kisatchie National Forest."

In December 2010, I issued a decision to prohibit dog-deer hunting on the Kisatchie NF. That decision was appealed to the Chief of the Forest Service in Washington, D.C. After several months of deliberation, the Chief reversed my earlier decision and issued instructions regarding how to prepare a new analysis and decision. The new process began with scoping in September 2011.

Reasons for the Decision

In making my decision, I considered the environmental analysis (EA) in its entirety. The following are examples of the most important considerations from that document:

Recreation and Land Use

Hunting is a popular outdoor recreation activity in Louisiana and one of the many types of outdoor recreation for which the KNF is valued. The 2010 National Visitor Use Monitoring survey of people using the KNF reported that viewing wildlife (47%), hiking/walking (40%), and hunting (39%) were the three activities with the greatest percentage of participation. Hunters and non-hunters or dispersed recreation users share the general forest area. Dog-deer hunting uses a large land area and once the dogs are turned loose, there is little control over their route of travel or behavior. Over the past few years, we have continued to receive complaints from hikers, bicyclists, and other recreational users of the Forest about unsafe and even threatening behavior during encounters with dog-deer hunters (EA, pp. 26-28). Recreationists have experienced a variety of nuisances, including noise, blocked roads, littering, and speeding on Forest roads, due to the presence of dog-deer hunters.

Deer hunting itself is diverse. Deer season is split into archery season, primitive firearms, general gun season and "with or without dogs" (dog-deer) season. The typical deer season in Louisiana runs from October 1st through January 31st. There are several methods of hunting deer: still hunting, stalk hunting, hunting from a stand, and dog-deer hunting. While all the methods vary, still, stalk, and stand hunting are very similar in nature whereas dog-deer hunting is very different from still hunting. Still, stalk, and hunting from a stand are stealth activities. They involve studying the land, studying the prey, and scouting the land for the location which will provide the best opportunity to locate a deer. Dog-deer hunters typically will turn out the dogs in an area or on a trail and let the dogs pick up a scent trail. Dogs then chase the deer, driving it in front of them while the hunters are positioned to shoot the deer as it comes out in an opening. Therefore, dogs turned loose by dog-deer hunters that run through an area in which a still hunter is set up, will scare off any deer that may have been in the area. This leads to major feelings of frustration and conflict by the still hunters.

Some of this conflict has increased in recent years. Now, with portable GPS, cell phones, and other tracking devices, dog-deer hunters are more mobile and are able to track the dogs during the chase and better position themselves for shooting the deer. This can lead to more interference with other users. Under the selected alternative, conflict between recreation users of the Forest and dog-deer hunters would be eliminated. There would also be an elimination of goal interference and general conflict between still hunters and dog-deer hunters. The elimination of dog-deer hunting will reduce conflict or risk to other activities such as hiking, bird-watching, or horseback riding, but it will not eliminate all conflict or risk from any hunting activity since some forms of hunting will still occur. Other types of hunting with dogs will continue to be allowed.

Public Safety

Dog-deer hunting is very different from still hunting and typically involves a group of hunters hunting together. The group releases their dogs to pursue or “drive” the deer and move in sync with the pace of the dogs to get in front of the deer’s movement. It is during these “drives” where violations of federal, state and local laws, regulations and rules, trespass onto private property and conflict with other hunters and forest users can and do occur. US Forest Service Law Enforcement and Investigations’ (USFS LEI) Officers and Agents, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries’ (LDWF) Agents, Louisiana Highway Patrol’s (LHP) Troopers and local authorities (Sheriff’s Departments, Parish Officers, etc) have witnessed, investigated, resolved, documented and cited incidents associated with hunting deer with the aid of dogs.

Analysis of the data on citations and violation notices written by USFS LEI and Louisiana LDWF agents shows that a disproportionate number are issued to deer hunters during the dog-deer season (EA pp. 22-26). In addition, the number of LDWF citations and warnings for safety-related violations makes up almost half the total issued by that agency over a four-year period during dog-deer season (EA, pp. 25-26).

In addition to instances where violation notices were issued, during the 2006 to 2010 dog-deer seasons USFS law enforcement personnel responded to calls for service from private landowners to investigate or resolve incidents where deer dogs and dog-deer hunters had trespassed onto their property. Law enforcement officials have also investigated incidents where trespassing dogs have been blamed for harming domestic livestock or family pets, for shooting in the vicinity of hikers and bicyclists, and for intimidating people who complained about potentially illegal activity. In many of these occurrences, by the time law enforcement officials arrived, the dog owners had already retrieved their dogs and left the area so no citations were given.

Under the selected alternative, traffic-related violations and confrontations with other recreationists and adjacent landowners are expected to decrease during the time of year that dog-deer hunting typically occurs.

Social

Trends in land availability for outdoor recreation and trends in population will cause major shifts and congestion in outdoor recreation by the year 2060. It is likely that the area available for hunting, and especially dog-deer hunting, will decrease in the future. This is due to the trend toward private lands being sold and/or divided up into smaller portions, and the reluctance of landowners currently to have this kind of activity on their lands.

Some KNF users (hunters and other recreationists) and neighboring landowners have said that dog-deer hunting is increasing user conflicts on the Forest. They say that this method of hunting impacts other Forest users when deer-hunting dogs range beyond the control of hunters and trespass onto private lands and leases. Landowners living near the KNF have reported personal property vandalism, livestock harassment, personal confrontations, shooting from and across roads, shooting near homes and road damage from the influx of dog-deer hunters each year.

The selected alternative will not preserve the tradition and culture of dog-deer hunting. It will however position the agency to respond to the greater demands of the non-hunting public while preserving still-hunting opportunities, and the opportunity to hunt other types of game with dogs. Due to still hunters requiring less land area, this alternative may allow the KNF to absorb an additional influx of still hunters without adding additional conflict or displacement to the non-hunting public.

Economic

The economies of the parishes in and around the KNF are typically rural and slow-growing, dominated by small businesses. The small businesses benefit from the visitors and recreationists that are attracted to the national forest. Forest visitors purchase food, gas, and lodging that help the local economies. National forest visitors enjoy the scenery, watch birds, photograph pictures, hunt, and engage in other recreational activities. Trail riders, hunters, hikers, swimmers, and campers come to the Forest to enjoy its amenities. These visitors boost the local economies. The estimated spending for Kisatchie National Forest visitors, last measured in 2005, is over \$8 million.

In 2010, a deer hunting license for a Louisiana resident cost \$14 (plus \$15 for a basic hunting license). There are no additional license fees for using dogs to hunt deer. Compared to other hunting and recreation expenditures, license fees paid to the state do not have a large local economic impact that can be traced back to specific parishes. Estimates derived using the economic model IMPLAN (EA pp. 50-52) indicate that spending on dog-deer hunting (including expenditures related to the care of the dogs themselves) contributes to between approximately 18 to 29 jobs, and results in between roughly \$890,000 and \$1,400,000 of income. For context, there were over 200,000 jobs reported in the area in April, 2011 (EA, Table 7, p. 48).

For the selected alternative, it is likely that some economic benefits will be lost, depending on whether dog-deer hunters leave the area to pursue their sport elsewhere, or remain in the area and switch to other forms of hunting, or quit hunting altogether. North Louisiana is more economically disadvantaged than the State as a whole (see

Table 6 and Table 7); therefore hunters from the area could be impacted if their costs rise. Although it is uncertain what choices dog-deer hunters will make as a result of my decision, it is clear that opportunities to hunt deer with dogs will remain available on private land, although at greater cost to individuals. I feel that the social benefits of eliminating a source of conflict among forest users greatly outweighs the potential disadvantage to one set of users.

Summary

Although the EA explores other environmental effects related to management concerns identified during the interdisciplinary process, the three topics discussed above form the core of my reasons for selecting Alternative 2, and prohibiting the use of dogs to hunt deer on the Kisatchie National Forest.

Conflicts between hunters and other recreationists, and between still hunters and dog-deer hunters, have been foremost in my mind as I considered this proposal. There is a long history of controversy and conflict surrounding dog-deer hunting, and our analysis has confirmed that tensions are likely to increase as the population in central Louisiana grows and changes. Efforts to manage the situation by shortening the season have not worked, and proposals to reduce the land area available for dog-deer hunting were found to be unfeasible.

We have also tried to better coordinate our law enforcement activity among the U.S. Forest Service Law Enforcement and Investigations' (USFS LEI) Officers and Agents, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries' (LDWF) Agents, Louisiana Highway Patrol's (LHP) Troopers, and local authorities (Sheriff's Departments, Parish Officers). This has made policing somewhat more effective, but has not resulted in a lessening of the problem. In fact, our data suggest that the incidence of law violations, including ones that threaten public safety, remains disproportionately higher during dog-deer season than during the general deer hunting season.

Finally, I considered the effect that a prohibition on deer hunting with dogs would have on the social and economic fabric of the parishes of central Louisiana. Although it is likely that there will be some impacts to the local businesses and to the dog-deer hunters, themselves, the impact is small relative to the overall economy of the area and of the State. Dog-deer hunters will still have opportunities to hunt, just not on National Forest land.

It is for these reasons that I have chosen to implement Alternative 2, which will prohibit the use of dogs when hunting deer on the Kisatchie National Forest.

Alternatives Considered

In addition to the selected alternative, I considered two other alternatives in detail, as well as several other ideas for potential alternatives. A comparison of these alternatives can be found in the EA on pages 15-21.

Alternative 1- No Action

This alternative would not amend the *Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Kisatchie National Forest* (1999). The use of dogs to hunt deer on the Forest would be determined each year through consultations with the LDWF. The existing Forest Plan guideline (FW-707) would remain in effect. This alternative was not selected because it is not responsive to the purpose and need for the proposal, and is not supported by the preponderance of comments submitted by the public and other stakeholders. It would allow the current conflicts among the various types of hunters and other, non-hunting recreationists, to continue.

Alternative 2 - Proposal

This alternative would amend the *Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Kisatchie National Forest* (1999) by adding a new standard to prohibit the use of dogs to hunt deer on the entire Kisatchie National Forest (KNF).

Alternative 3 – Designated Dog-Deer Hunting Areas

This alternative would also amend the *Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Kisatchie National Forest* (1999) by adding a new standard to prohibit the use of dogs to hunt deer on the Kisatchie National Forest (KNF) EXCEPT where designated. The season length would also be limited to a maximum of 9 consecutive days each year, similar to its current length. Maps of the designated areas are shown in Appendix A of the EA. This alternative was not selected because it would be difficult to enforce, and would tend to concentrate hunters and dogs onto a smaller land base, potentially increasing the types of conflict that the proposal seeks to eliminate.

Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Study

Various methods to control how dog-deer hunting is conducted were proposed, including the use of a permit system (EA, pages 17-19). These were considered to be consistent with the purpose and need for the proposal, but their overall influence on effects was considered to be relatively small. The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries in consultation with the Kisatchie National Forest implemented a permit system for all deer hunting, with and without dogs, on the KNF during a portion of the 2010 hunting season. During these dates all deer hunters were required to have a permit and deer hunters using dogs had to register an identifying mark. Each dog was required to wear a collar with the owner's name, address, and phone number (LDWF, 2010). All hunters were required to submit a report of their hunt by March 1, 2011. Although the reason for utilizing the permit and collar system was to mitigate conflicts, there were no apparent changes noted in dogdeer hunter conflicts.

Public Involvement

The need for this proposal arose when the previous decision to prohibit dog-deer hunting, issued in December 2010, was reversed on appeal. The original proposal was never removed from the *Schedule of Proposed Actions* on the Forest's website.

In September 2011, the Forest Service restated its 2009 proposal and asked the public to provide any new comments they may have about the re-stated proposal or the

original environmental analysis. A scoping proposal letter was mailed to approximately 1,300 public contacts and individuals, and a scoping notice was placed in the Alexandria Town Talk (the Forest's newspaper of record) in September 2011. News releases followed requesting comments on the Forest's proposal.

During the scoping period, many collaborating agencies and interested citizen groups that may not have received a scoping letter were also informed of the proposal. A listing of the individuals and organizations contacted can be found in the EA on pages 84-119. Since then, the KNF has followed the steps in the NEPA process, which includes a provision for public notice and comment as well as providing for analysis based on substantive issues and not merely voting. It is a process available to all publics, not only those most vocal or nearby. The current round of scoping has generated over 1,300 comments, all of which were restatements of comments received during the 2009-2010 analysis.

Interdisciplinary team (IDT) meetings were held from September through December 2011 to identify concerns, clarify any issues derived from public involvement, and explore the need for new alternatives. The Forest Service verified the three significant issues identified during their previous round of scoping. These issues included: public safety; impacts on recreation and other land uses; and social and economic impacts.

Related issues or concerns (or non-significant issues) were not used to generate alternatives, but because they generate some conflict, were used to help prescribe management requirements, or analyze environmental effects. These related concerns included: the biological needs for deer; and the disparity with state/private land use policies.

The effects relating to each of these concerns were analyzed in detail for all three alternatives in Chapter 3 of the EA. The final EA was distributed for public review in December 2011, and over 800 additional comments were received.

Finding of No Significant Impact

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA, I have determined that actions associated with this decision will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared. I base my finding on the following:

1. Beneficial and adverse effects were given equal consideration (EA, throughout Environmental Consequences, pages 20 thru 60).
2. The actions will not adversely affect public health or safety (EA, page 23).
3. The unique characteristics of the geographic area, such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically-critical areas will not be affected (EA, throughout Environmental Consequences, pages 20 thru 60).
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial (EA, throughout Environmental Consequences, pages 20 thru 60).

5. We have considerable experience with the types of activities to be implemented. The effects analysis shows the effects are not uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risk (EA, throughout Environmental Consequences, pages 20 thru 60).
6. The action will not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration (EA, analysis of cumulative effects throughout Environmental Consequences, pages 20 thru 60).
7. These actions are not related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts (EA, analysis of cumulative effects throughout Environmental Consequences, pages 20 thru 60).
8. The actions will not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (EA, page 48).
9. The actions will not adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (EA, pages 49 thru 57; EA, Appendix B, Biological Evaluation).
10. The actions do not threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (EA, throughout Environmental Consequences, pages 20 thru 60; below, in Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations).

Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations

The Forest Service is currently operating under the November 9, 2000 planning rule (see *Federal Register*, December 18, 2009). According to 36 CFR 219.35 and Appendix B to 219.35, the responsible official may elect to conduct the plan amendment process under the "1982 planning regulations" (those regulations in effect before November 9, 2000). I have elected to conduct this amendment following the 1982 planning regulations. After reviewing the Environmental Assessment, I have determined that the decision to implement this amendment will not result in a significant change to the Kisatchie's Revised Land and Resource Management Plan. The determination that this is a non-significant amendment is made in accordance with 16 USC 1604(f)(4), 36 CFR 219.10(f) (1982 regulations), and Forest Service Manual 1926.5. This plan amendment meets the criteria for a non-significant amendment because these changes will not "significantly alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management" and they will not "significantly alter the long-term relationship between levels of multiple-use goods and services originally projected" (FSM 1926.5).

In accordance with FSM 2672.4, a Biological Evaluation (fauna and flora) were prepared to evaluate the effects of the planned activities on PETS species (EA, Appendix B). The chosen management direction (Alternative 2) is not likely to adversely affect the Red-cockaded Woodpecker. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has concurred with this determination (EA, Appendix G) as it relates to threatened and endangered species. The proposed actions are not likely to cause a trend toward federal listing or a loss of viability for any sensitive species.

The effect of the chosen actions on Management Indicator Species (MIS) will be minimal. Acres of suitable habitat will not change and habitat conditions desired by the Revised Land Management Plan for the Plan area will be improved and not be adversely affected. Forest-wide MIS conditions and trends will continue to be monitored annually and reports updated at least once every five years in order to document that this assumption can be supported.

This management direction is compatible with the current land and resource allocation needed to achieve the desired future conditions described in the Kisatchie National Forest's Forest Plan.

The management practices and activities are consistent with the National Forest Management Act (NFMA 16 USC 1604(i), NFMA regulations (36 CFR 219) and agency manuals, handbooks, and directives in effect December 2009.

Implementation Date

This decision is effective **seven days** after publishing the legal notice of this decision in the newspaper of record (*The Town Talk*, Alexandria, LA).

Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

For plan amendments conducted under the "1982 planning regulations" the responsible official can elect to use either the "Optional Procedures Available during the Planning Rule Transition Period" (the former 36 CFR 217 appeal procedures that were in effect prior to November 9, 2000) or the Objection procedures of 36 CFR 219.32 from the 2000 planning rule (see Appendix A to 36 CFR 219.35 [*Federal Register*, December 18, 2009]). For this decision, I have decided to use the "Optional Appeal Procedures".

A written notice of appeal must be filed in duplicate and postmarked or received within 45 days of the publication of the legal notice. The appeal must clearly state that it is a Notice of Appeal being filed pursuant to the Optional Appeal Procedures. Appeals must meet the content requirements of Section 9 of the Optional Appeal Procedures, which are available for review at

<http://www.fs.fed.us/emc/applit/includes/PlanAppealProceduresDuringTransition.pdf>.

Appeals must be filed with the Chief of the Forest Service at:

Regular Mail:

USDA Forest Service
ATTN: EMC Appeals
Mail Stop 1104
1400 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20250-1104

Private Carrier or Hand Delivery:

USDA Forest Service
Ecosystem Management Coordination
Attn: Appeals
Yates Bldg., 3CEN


201 14th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20250

(Note: If a phone number is needed for carrier delivery, use 202-205-0895)

Appeals may also be mailed electronically in a common digital format to
appeals-chief@fs.fed.us.

Contact

For additional information concerning this decision or the Forest Service appeal process, contact Chris Liggett, Director, Planning, 1720 Peachtree Road NW, Atlanta, GA, 30309. Mr. Liggett may be reached at 404.347.3183.


Elizabeth Agpaoa
Regional Forester

Feb 29, 2012
Date

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Attachment A

Amendment #9 to Kisatchie National Forest's Revised Land Management Plan February 2012

Amendment #9 to the *Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Kisatchie National Forest* (1999) adds a new standard that prohibits the use of dogs to hunt deer on the entire Kisatchie National Forest (KNF). Forest Plan guideline FW-707 (on page 2-26) remains in effect.

Plan, Chapter 2

Add the following new direction:

FW-DD1: Prohibit use of dogs to hunt deer on the Forest. Other kinds of hunting with dogs are allowed throughout the Forest (in accordance with state hunting regulations) unless site-specific management direction prohibits the use (such as on administrative sites and the National Wildlife Preserves). **(KNF)**
(STANDARD)

This amendment is not a significant change to the Revised Land and Resource Management Plan for the Kisatchie National Forest. The determination that this is a non-significant amendment is made in accordance with 16 USC 1604(f)(4), 36 CFR 219.10(f) (1982 regulations, as authorized by 36 CFR 219.35 of the current planning regulations, dated November 9, 2000 and Appendix B to 219.35 [see *Federal Register*, December 18, 2009]), and Forest Service Manual 1926.5. This plan amendment meets the criteria for a non-significant amendment because these changes will not "significantly alter the multiple-use goals and objectives for long-term land and resource management" and they will not "significantly alter the long-term relationship between levels of multiple-use goods and services originally projected" (FSM 1926.5). The NEPA analysis for this change is documented in a Decision Notice and Environmental Assessment.